

University of Dayton eCommons

Academic Senate Minutes

Academic Senate

4-26-2019

2019-04-26 Minutes of the Academic Senate

University of Dayton. Academic Senate

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_mins

Recommended Citation

University of Dayton. Academic Senate, "2019-04-26 Minutes of the Academic Senate" (2019). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 152.
https://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_mins/152

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Academic Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of eCommons. For more information, please contact frice1@udayton.edu, mschlange1@udayton.edu.

Approved Minutes

Meeting of the University of Dayton Academic Senate

April 26, 2019

Kennedy Union Ballroom, 3:30-5:30 p.m.

Corinne Daprano, President

Present: Joanna Abdallah, Paul Benson, Leila Chamankhah, Anne Crecelius, Corinne Daprano, Neomi DeAnda, Mary Ellen Dillon, Lee Dixon, Sam Dorf, Shannon Driskell, Jim Dunne, Deo Eustace, Myrna Gabbe, Brad Hoefflin, Mark Jacobs, Jay Janney, Suki Kwon, Noah Leibold, Leslie Picca, Jason Pierce, Maher Qumsiyeh, Fran Rice, Eddy Rojas, Markus Rumpfkeil, Connor Savage, Andrea Seielstad, Todd Smith, Tereza Szeghi, Kathy Webb, Lynne Yengulalp

Absent: Vijay Asari, James Brill, Rowen Gray, Kevin Kelly, Laura Leming, Willow Lopez, John Mittelstaedt, Andrew Strauss, Diandra Walker, John White

Guests: Amy Anderson, Deb Bickford, Connie Bowman, Susan Brown, Wiebke Diestelkamp, James Farrelly, Linda Hartley, Brad Hoefflin, Jake Jagels, Jane Koester, Carissa Krane, Mike Krug, Catherine Kublik, Sayeh Meisami, Lee Miller, Heather Parsons, Carolyn Phelps, Maher Qumsiyeh, Andrew Sarangan, Joe Valenzano, Paul Vanderburgh

1. Opening Prayer/Meditation: Sam Dorf
2. Minutes of April 12, 2019: Approved without objection
3. Wiebke Diestelkamp (MTH chair) presented a proposal from the Department of Mathematics and the College of Arts and Sciences to suspend the Master's of Mathematics Education. (The proposal is appended.) Discussion followed. A motion was made to approve the proposal. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.
4. Corinne Daprano (HSS chair) and Anne Crecelius (HSS) presented two proposals for the reorganization of the majors within HSS. In the proposals, HSS will have three majors, BSHS: Bachelor of Science in Health Science, BSSW: Bachelor of Science in Sport and Wellness, and BSN: Bachelor of Science in Nursing.

Discussion followed. Markus Rumpfkeil asked if current students can switch majors. Anne Crecelius replied that yes they may switch. There is enough flexibility to make it possible. Mary Ellen Dillon asked if PPT will still be offered as a major for students who want to apply to PT school? Anne Crecelius replied no, and elaborated that looking at PT admissions by major, it should not be a big deal. Having a PPT degree is no guarantee to getting into PT school. Mary Ellen Dillon asked if we have enough instructional staff to facilitate this change. Paul Benson, Jason Pierce, and Corinne Daprano responded that it has been looked at and plans are being

made. A motion was made to approve both proposals. The motion was seconded and approved with one abstention.

5. Mark Jacobs (FAC chair) presented a proposal from the FAC for revisions to the University Promotion and Tenure document (DOC 2006-10 University Promotion and Tenure Policy). (See appendix 8b.) Jim Dunne proposed some edits to the document. A motion was made to accept the edits and move forward with the edited document. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

Discussion of the edited version followed. Anne Crecelius asked if we should take this all the way to the necessary full faculty vote in anticipation of future additional changes that would be made to the document as follow up work from UPTPTF continues. Sam Dorf asked if we could accept the changes to the document but put off the full faculty vote. Jim Farrelly was concerned that we shouldn't be creating a revised document, but instead create a new document for consideration by the full faculty. Jason Pierce commented that work is currently being done to create a DEI report with possible action items that might affect this document. Perhaps we should wait for that report as well. Mark Jacobs responded that FAC wanted to complete some of the work that needed to be done, rather than waiting. Markus Rumpfkeil agreed that doing the work in smaller, bite-size chunks, makes it easier. Jim Dunne agreed. Anne Crecelius asked about the possibility of delaying the full vote. Paul Benson suggested that it might get tabled at the next step at the Provost's Council. Sam Dorf asked about the process of tabling the proposal at this point rather than sending it to the Provost's Council.

A motion was made to table the proposal. The motion was seconded. The vote was 17 for and 7 against, with 2 abstentions. The proposal has been tabled.

6. Lee Dixon (SAPC chair) presented a report from the SAPC regarding policies that need to be considered by the Policy Review on Promotion & Tenure Policies Working Group (PRoPT) while working on the UPTPTF recommendations. (The presentation is appended.)
7. Sam Dorf (ECAS) presented a resolution to the Academic Senate that the recommendations of the UPTPTF report be adopted and that working on these be prioritized and timely. (The resolution is appended.) Jim Dunne asked if this is feasible. Corinne Daprano said yes, ECAS has looked at a timeline. A motion was made to approve the resolution. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.
8. **Committee Reports** (end of the year reports are appended)
 - a. APC – Anne Crecelius
 - b. FAC – Mark Jacobs
 - c. SAPC – Lee Dixon
 - d. ECAS – Corinne Daprano

9. Corinne Daprano (Academic Senate President) and Leslie Picca (Academic Senate Vice President) presented a proposal for revisions to DOC 2007-05 Processes and Procedures of the Academic Senate, so that the document would contain the work of the Academic Senate for AY18/19. A motion was made to approve the resolution. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

10. Thank you to Tyler Dunham for his work as parliamentarian of the Academic Senate.

11. Paul Benson (Provost) seated the new members of the Academic Senate, thanked the outgoing Senators and conducted elections. The results of the elections and the members of the subcommittees are:

President = Mark Jacobs

Vice President = Leslie Picca

Secretary = Fran Rice

ECAS = Anne Crecelius (SEHS), Sam Dorf (CAS - Hum), Shannon Driskell (CAS - NS), Deo Eustace (SOE), Mark Jacobs (SBA), Leslie Picca (CAS - SSc), Jason Pierce (Dean), Fran Rice (LIB), and Andrea Sielstad (LAW).

FAC Chair = Andrea Seielstad

FAC = Anne Crecelius (SEHS), Lissa Cupp (Adjunct), Corinne Daprano (SEHS - Interim Dean), Lee Dixon (CAS - SSc), Sam Dorf (CAS - Hum), Shannon Driskell (CAS - NS), Mark Jacobs (SBA), Sayeh Meisami (CAS - Hum), Andrew Sarangan (SOE), Andrea Seielstad (LAW), and Kathy Webb (LIB - Dean).

APC Chair = Jim Dunne

APC: Connie Bowman (SEHS), Neomi DeAnda (CAS - Hum), Mary Ellen Dillon (NTT), Jim Dunne (SBA), Deo Eustace (SOE), John Mittelstaedt (SBA - Dean), Leslie Picca (CAS - SSc), Jason Pierce (CAS - Dean), Maher Qumsiyeh (CAS - NS), and Tereza Szeghi (CAS - Hum).

SAPC Chair = Laura Leming

SAPC: Vijay Asari (SOE), Jay Janney (SBA), Catherine Kublik (CAS - NS), Suki Kwon (CAS - Hum), Laura Leming (CAS - SSc), Fran Rice (LIB), Eddy Rojas (SOE - Dean), Andy Strauss (LAW), and John White (SEHS).

Appendices:

3. Proposal to Suspend Master's of Mathematics Education

SUBMITTED BY: College of Arts and Sciences and the Department of Mathematics

DATE: April 15, 2019

ACTION: Legislative Action

RATIONALE: The Master's of Mathematic Education was envisioned primarily as a vehicle that would provide licensed professional educators with a graduate degree. At the time of the concentration's greatest popularity, graduate degrees were a key part of the seniority rubric used by school districts in Ohio; possessing a Master's level degree had better prospects for professional advancement than those who only had Bachelor's level degrees. Over time, that requirement has changed and/or been eliminated in many cases. As such, the program has become less popular, leading to a general decline in its enrollment.

1. Rationale for the suspension of the Program:

The Master's of Mathematic Education was envisioned primarily as a vehicle that would provide licensed professional educators with a graduate degree. At the time of the concentration's greatest popularity, graduate degrees were a key part of the seniority rubric used by school districts in Ohio; possessing a Master's level degree had better prospects for professional advancement than those who only had Bachelor's level degrees. Over time, that requirement has changed and/or been eliminated in many cases. As such, the program has become less popular, leading to a general decline in its enrollment.

2. Description of the effect on other degree programs and actions to be taken:

Discontinuing this program will have no impact on other degree programs. The program is a summer-only program, and its courses were taught by faculty who otherwise do not teach in the summer term. The effect of discontinuing this program will be to free up faculty for other priorities they wish to pursue.

3. Faculty Members that teach in this program:

The only faculty members who have taught in the program in the last few years are Dr. Becky Krakowski and Dr. Jonathan Brown.

4. Enrollment in the program over the last five years, by year:

See separate Excel file. I cannot find the first three names in DegreeWorks. It seems none of the students have actually completed the degree.

5. Courses in the degree program and service courses that will be not offered during the suspension period:

All courses needed for the students who are still in the program can be offered or replaced by alternate courses for the students who are still in the program.

6. Effects of suspension on current faculty and staff that support this program:

None. This is a summer-only program. Faculty will be able to focus on other priorities during the summer.

7. Effects of suspension on current and prospective students; consultations with Enrollment Management:

Current students: We will offer students who have not completed all mathematics courses the option of taking these courses as independent study. No new students will be accepted into the program.

8. Disposition of facilities, library and information resources, and other resources used to support the program:

This has no impact on resources

9. Plan and timetable to be used to review program status and to decide whether to discontinue or reactivate the program at the end of the suspension period.

The Department of Mathematics anticipates a suspension of no more than five years. If current legislation around career advancement changes, then the department would be prepared to offer the MME degree again.

6. SAPC Recommendations Regarding Policies that Would Likely Be Affected by Changes to the University Promotion and Tenure Policy

April 23, 2019

The following was sent to SAPC:

ECAS requests that the SAPC review the policies listed in the Faculty Handbook and the UPTPTF report (p. 10-11), to prioritize the list and begin an initial determination of the gaps and/or misalignment in existing policies with the current UPT policy.

Recommendation #3 of the UPTP task force concerns this review (see below):

3. Relevant University policies that support the implementation of the criteria for evaluation and review of all faculty be revised to introduce/address emerging mission/values-based criteria and the processes for the evaluation of evidence/impact-based faculty performance. This requires the revision of all of the relevant policies on faculty evaluation, peer evaluation, evaluation of teaching, merit, workload, and post-tenure review, currently found in the Faculty Policy and Governance Handbook. In addition, revisions to Promotion and Tenure Policies will likely impact the Clinical Faculty Promotion Policy and the Lecturer Promotion Policy. The policies relevant to promotion and tenure, the task force charge, and those that will be potentially impacted by revisions of promotion and tenure policies include the following: (see p. 10-11 UPTPTF report).

SAPC Recommendations:

- Section IV.9 Recommendations for Revision to the University Faculty Workload Guidelines (pp 29-34)

These guidelines were to be reviewed by FAC no more than five years after their approval in 12/12. To my knowledge this hasn't happened. If changes are to be made to the University P&T policy that reflect the report's recommendation that criteria for evaluation and review of faculty be revised to introduce/address emerging mission/values-based criteria and the processes for the evaluation of evidence/impact-based faculty performance, then ultimately, these guidelines will need to reflect those changes. In particular, workload should be shifted to align with P&T policies, meaning that ultimately the mission of UD should drive more of the activities that are promoted and assigned/appreciated. Although the guidelines currently mention service to the community and such, there is no specific language regarding workload and its relation to the mission of the university. Further, any changes to how continuous faculty/professional development are incorporated into the P&T policy would need to be reflected here, as would changes related to other recommendations (e.g., recognizing additional areas of impact, etc.). If changes are made to the University P&T policy, it should perhaps encourage or require that units and departments have clear workload guidelines that are in alignment with their P&T and merit guidelines.

- Section IV.10 University Policy on Faculty Evaluation (pp. 34-38)

Although the guidelines currently mention the "purposes of the University of Dayton," there is no specificity regarding what that means, nor is there any mention of the mission of the university. Further, this policy does not mention that Faculty Evaluation must align in any way with P&T

policies, nor be informed by workload issues/policy, although it does mention that “Faculty Evaluation” can be used for “retention and tenure decisions.” Any changes to how SET are used to evaluate teaching in the P&T policy would need to be reflected in Section IV.14; those changes would need to be reflected here in section IV.10.H. Any changes to how continuous faculty/professional development are incorporated into the P&T policy would need to be reflected here as well.

- Section IV.11 University Promotion and Tenure Policy (pp.38-44): *Academic Senate DOC 2006-10*

This is the policy that the UPTPTF reviewed and reported on. We see no need for us to address this, as it seems to do so would be redundant.

- Section IV.12 University Promotion Policy for Clinical Faculty/Faculty of Practice (pp. 45-51): *Academic Senate DOC 2017-01*

Any changes to P&T policy that would apply to this section would need to be reflected here.

- Section IV.13 University Promotion Policy for Lecturers (pp. 51-58):

Academic Senate DOC 2018-03 Any changes to P&T policy that would apply to this section would need to be reflected here.

Academic Senate DOC 2006-08 Any changes in the P&T policy that address issues related to the importance of addressing diversity and inclusion, as defined by the university, experiential learning, peer evaluation of teaching, revised use of the SET, etc., would need to be reflected here. Those changes would ultimately affect all sections mentioned above, as well as sections IV.14 and IV.15.

- Section IV.14 Evaluating Teaching for the Purpose of Tenure (pp. 59-63):

- Section IV.14. Use of Faculty Teaching Evaluations Results for Making Merit Decisions (pp. 61-62)

Any changes made to section IV.14 would need to be reflected here. This section should be number IV.15.

- Section IV.15 Review of Tenured Faculty (pp. 63-67): *Academic Senate DOC 2006-11*

Any changes to P&T should inform this section. In other words, that which is valued prior to any promotion should be valued and evaluated post-promotion.

- Section IV. 19 Policy on Faculty Employment Outside of the University (pp. 69- 74): *Academic Senate DOC 2018-07*

Because this document mentions P&T, if any changes are made to the P&T policy, this document should be reevaluated to determine whether changes need to be made to it to be in alignment.

- Section VII. 6 Intellectual Property Policy and Procedures (pp.103-120):

Academic Senate DOC 1994-08. We do not have any recommendations at this time.

- Section VIII.6 University Assessment (p. 122)

This section should perhaps mention that assessment does not include the use of the SET. Further, it should likely refer to and reflect language outlined in *Academic Senate DOC 2017-4*, *University Policy on the Assessment for Undergraduate Student Learning*. For example, that

document states that “Undergraduate student learning assessment is not program evaluation or review, and is not an evaluation of faculty or student performance at the course-level.”

- Section IX. 9 Policy on Faculty Compensation in Excess of Annualized Base Salary (pp. 129-134): *Academic Senate DOC 2018-06*

We do not have any recommendations at this time.

Not in Faculty Handbook:

- University Policy on the Assessment for Undergraduate Student Learning

Academic Senate DOC 2017-04

This policy does not mention P&T or SET, nor likely should it, thus it doesn't seem this policy would need to change. However, given the importance of assessment for continuous teaching/learning improvement, as well as university accreditation, the P&T document and handbook may want to reflect the importance of assessment and its need/demand.

7. RES 2019-01

Resolution to the Academic Senate

Title: Adoption of University Promotion and Tenure Policy Task Force Report Submitted by:
Executive Committee of the Academic Senate Date: 26 April 2019

WHEREAS the University Promotion and Tenure Policy Task Force presented their final report to the Academic Senate on 25 January 2019; and

WHEREAS the University Promotion and Tenure Policy Task Force made observations and recommendations for policy changes to better align emergent interpretations and/or practice of mission centric activities with promotion and tenure criteria; and

WHEREAS the Academic Senate acknowledges the importance of the University Promotion and Tenure Policy Task Force's report; and

WHEREAS the Academic Senate commits to prioritizing the evaluation of the recommendations laid out by the University Promotion and Tenure Policy Task Force; and

WHEREAS the Academic Senate commits to prioritizing the development of appropriate policies to address the recommendations made by the University Promotion and Tenure Policy Task Force; and

THEREFORE, LET IT BE RESOLVED that the Academic Senate will complete this work within one year's time.

8a: Final APC Report for Academic Year 2018-2019

Date: April 26th, 2019

Membership Chair: Anne Crecelius; Members: Vijay Asari, Neomi De Anda, Sam Dorf, Jim Dunne, Laura Leming, John Mittelstaedt, Jason Pierce, Lynne Yengulalp, Deb Bickford (ex-officio), Philip Appiah-Kubi (Faculty Board), Noah Leibold (SGA)

As chair, I thank the Academic Policies Committee for their dedicated work over the course of the academic year 2018-2019. We met nearly every week, having thoughtful discourse and accomplishing a number of important tasks. I would also like to especially thank Sam Dorf for his additional service on ECAS and Jim Dunne for serving on CAP-C.

Our committee's work during the 2018-2019 Academic Year can be summarized as follows:

- Oversight of CAP
 - Received a report from CAP-C in Fall 2018.
 - Received a follow-up report from CAP-C and approved CAP-L appointments.
 - Met with the Assistant Provost for the Common Academic Program, Dr. Michelle Pautz.
- Review of New Programs
 - Reviewed and approved the Group Facilitation and Leadership Certificate, which was subsequently approved by Senate.
 - Reviewed and approved the Bachelor of Science, Sustainability degree program, which was subsequently approved by Senate.
 - Reviewed and approved the Bachelor of Arts, Sustainability degree program, which was subsequently approved by Senate.
 - Reviewed and approved the proposals to reorganize the programs within Health and Sport Science (Bachelor of Science in Health Science and Bachelor of Science in Sport and Wellness degree programs)
- Initial Charges from ECAS
 - Wrote a report and revised the policy DOC 2014-04 Actions pertaining to degree programs and academic departments. The revised policy was approved by the Senate.
- Other
 - In Fall 2018, we presented our report on the China Institute that had been completed in AY 17-18.
 - The committee stayed apprised on the work of the Transfer Credit Task Force via updates from A. Crecelius, who served on this task force as representative of the Academic Senate.

In more detail, APC was pleased to hear from CAP-C that the second round of 4 year reviews for CAP approved courses was even more successful than the previous years,

with most courses receiving 4 year reapproval. At the year-end report, the committee discussed the need to identify potential issues for discussion in AY 19-20 that may come up in the formal program review of CAP scheduled for AY 20-21. In addition, it is likely that minor changes to the CAP-C procedural document will be needed early in AY 19-20. The committee commends the work of the assistant provost for CAP in providing updates to the committee.

One undergraduate certificate was reviewed and approved by APC. As carry-over from AY 17-18, the Group Leadership and Facilitation certificate was reviewed, revisions/additions were requested, and subsequently approved. The certificate was well-received by the full Senate and was approved on April 12th, 2019. This certificate was the first to be reviewed after the prior year's work to revise the Undergraduate Certificate Policy. The new policy appeared to be straightforward. While having the certificate in the Program Inventory Management (PIM) system was helpful in tracking progress, it did require minor changes by the Senate President. Alternate approaches might need to be considered if the volume of reviews and/or changes increases. Full roll-back to the proposers might be necessary in those cases.

Multiple new degree programs were reviewed over the course of the year. The College of Arts and Sciences brought forth two parallel proposals, one for a BS and one for a BA, both in Sustainability. The committee reviewed these proposed programs and worked collaboratively with the proposers to improve the clarity of the proposals and fulfill all expectations of the policy on new programs. These proposals were presented to and approved by the full Senate on March 29th, 2019. The Department of Health and Sport Science also had two parallel proposals reviewed by APC. The proposals cover a reorganization of current offerings into two new degrees, a Bachelor of Science in Health Science (BSHS) and a Bachelor of Science in Sport and Wellness (BSSW). APC approved these programs and they will be presented to the full Senate at the final Senate meeting on April 26, 2019.

The revision of DOC 2014 - Actions Pertaining to Degree Programs and Academic Departments took most of the academic year. Multiple stakeholders were consulted and invited to meetings, an informal survey was distributed to department chairs, program directors, and recent proposers, and multiple meetings were dedicated to discussion and work on this document. A comprehensive view of the scope of our work in relation to the initial charge from ECAS was included in our report. The major revisions to the policy included:

- Restructuring and reorganizing the policy to improve clarity and concision.
- Reorganization of proposal format and updating of certain sections.
- Updated section on graduate proposals.
- Condensed discontinuation actions to one section.
- Added a section on merging/splitting academic degrees.
- Expanded the Approval Process section to add clarity.
- Added language regarding determination of university-wide impact and Senate actions.
- Added a section on consultation and templates as appendices to facilitate consultation processes. The revised policy was approved by the full senate on March 29th, 2019.

Early in the academic year, the APC delivered the report created in AY 17-18 on the structures, practices and experience of faculty at the China Institute. This work was presented to the full Senate on September 14, 2018.

Throughout the academic year, committee chair, Anne Crecelius gave periodic updates on the work of the Transfer Credit Task Force (TCTF), as she was representing APC and the Academic Senate on this task force. The committee had multiple discussions on transfer vs. transient credits, the use of external databases, and how transfer policies impact the Common Academic Program. The committee recommends continued conversations as the final report of the TCTF is given and any changes/actions are taken in response to the recommendations in the final report. In addition to accomplishing the aforementioned reviews, approvals, and reports, the committee discussed what issues might be considered in the coming academic year.

Several items remain from previous year-end reports, which remain issues to consider:

- In AY 17-18 in the course of review of certificates, the process by which 'mini courses' (prefixed "UDI") are approved and reviewed came up. This was also a topic of discussion in AY 16-17. Given the inclusion of these types of courses in multiple certificates, which are academic programs, it seems appropriate for the committee to review the approval process and procedures related to these academic credit courses.
- In AY 17-18, during discussion of changes to the CAP 4 year approval process, it was noted that if a course lost its approval, because that change would only be applied to a new catalog year, current students on previous catalog years could still take that course to fulfill requirements. In effect, the course would remain 'CAP approved' for 3 or more years for current students. Concerns were raised about this and a more broad conversation was had regarding what the practices and policies are for changes to the catalog and its impact on students. For example, can students change their catalog year? How are changes 'grandfathered in' for various catalog years? An examination of existing processes, procedures, and potential policies may be warranted. Work with the Registrar would need to be done in order to ensure systems clearly and accurately reflect when a course is no longer approved while not altering degree completion time for students.
- The year-end report from AY 16-17 suggested that given the rise in the number of online course offerings, academic policies might be reviewed in light of how they may or may not apply to online course delivery. The number of online offerings has continued to increase, including the addition of a new online partner (2U). We would recommend that current and potentially new academic policies should be considered in regard to how well they apply to online course delivery. In addition, a few new issues arose over the course of the committee's work:
- DOC 2014-02, calls for review of the Student Evaluation of Teaching:
 - "The Academic Senate will review all aspects of the SET after the completion of the two-year phase-in period for all units. Thereafter, the Associate Provost for

Academic Affairs and Learning Initiatives will initiate a review of the SET in conjunction with the Academic Senate, which shall be held at least every three years.”

○ This may require a multi-committee charge as SET contributes to not only Academic Policies, but also Faculty Affairs, and Student Academic Policies (all committees listed on DOC 2014-02).

- The Registrar has asked that the Academic Calendar Priorities be reviewed and updated. Per intra-office records, these priorities are set by Academic Policies Committee and Academic Senate and were last set and reviewed by APC in 2009.
- CAP-C has discussed whether courses that are cross-listed across multiple departments should appear on student transcripts from both departments. APC should consider what the broader implications of this change in transcript procedure might be and whether it should be recommended.
- As the Senate DOC 2010-04-mandated formal program review of CAP approaches (AY 20-21), APC should take an active role in the development of the review plan for CAP. In addition, the overall capacity of CAP-C to participate in this review given the workload of 4 year course reviews should be considered when determining the best structure for review.

8b: Report to the Academic Senate about the activities of the Faculty Affairs Committee for AY18/19

The Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) received several charges from the Executive Council of the Academic Senate (ECAS). These charges included:

- Charge #1
 - ECAS requests the FAC review and accept or revise changes to the Faculty Handbook as suggested by the Provost's Office.
 - ECAS requests that FAC also add a paragraph to section 4 part 8 of the Faculty Handbook that defines "Tenured" and "Tenure Track" faculty.
- Charge #2
 - ECAS requests the FAC review and make recommendations for changes to the Faculty Handbook for review and promotion of lecturers not attached to a department or unit.
- Charge #3
 - ECAS requests the FAC review and recommend changes to the bylaws of the Faculty Hearing Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure (FHC)
- Charge #4
 - ECAS requests the FAC revise the University Promotion and Tenure Policy (Document 2006-10) to include a definition of tenure, a robust mission and values statement that emphasizes the University commitment to diversity, equity and inclusion, and the function of promotion and tenure in furthering the mission of the university.
- Charge #5
 - ECAS requests the FAC revise the University Promotion and Tenure Policy (Document 2006-10) to include a directive that Units/departments identify and recognize specific mission and/or values-driven activities, commensurate with faculty academic, professional, and contractual expectations, in evidence/impact-based evaluation of faculty teaching and/or librarianship, scholarship/artistic creation, and service in Unit/Department promotion and tenure policies.

The FAC completed work on charges 1, 3, and 4. The details of the charge, work processes, and recommendations can be found below.

In the process of addressing items 1 and 3, the FAC consulted with the FHC. Through the ensuing discussions, the committee found problems with three documents / policies that involve the dismissal of a tenured / tenure track faculty member. Specifically, there are processes detailed in the FHC bylaws that are inconsistent with Section IV 3 E of the faculty handbook, which is further inconsistent with the Nondiscrimination and Anti-Harassment policy. The FAC strongly recommends that a charge be given to the 2019-2020 formulation of the committee to revise the dismissal section of the Faculty Handbook (Section IV 3 E). The section should be revised to reflect the developmental practices currently employed, e.g. performance plans, and potentially more closely aligned with AAUP guidelines. Furthermore the revisions should reconcile the lack of alignment between Section IV 3 E of the Faculty Handbook, the bylaws of the FHC, and the Nondiscrimination and Anti-Harassment policy. It is the

opinion of the FAC that all three policies / documents will need to be revised in order to create consistency across the documents. It is the opinion of the FAC that this work should be prioritized over the other existing uncompleted charges as the matter is of critical importance to the tenure rights of faculty.

Charges 2 and 5 were not taken up by the committee primarily due to running out of time. Charge 2 was prioritized behind charges 1 and 3. Charges 4 and 5 were given in the last few weeks of the committee's existence. Charge 4 was taken up because its completion seemed feasible given the remaining time whereas the other charges would have taken substantially more time than remained in the term.

Charge 4 required changes to Document 2006-10. Those changes are noted in red in appendix 3. This work was carried out exclusively within the FAC as ECAS did not suggest consultation. FAC presented this work to the full senate which voted to table the motion to approve the changes so that they could be coupled with additional changes anticipated next academic year.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark A. Jacobs, Ph.D.

Chair, AY 18-19 Faculty Affairs Committee

29 March 2019

Revisions of the Faculty Handbook by the Faculty Affairs Committee

The Faculty Affairs Committee of the academic Senate (FAC) was charged by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate (ECAS) to evaluate and revise as appropriate the Faculty Handbook pursuant to potential changes identified by the Provost's office.

The substance of the changes was the addition of preambles. Preambles contextualizing the handbook, the teaching, and research sections were added. The other request from the Provost's office was that tenure and tenure-track be defined. This was accomplished by adding the category of Ranked Faculty to section IV part 8 of the handbook. The addition reads: Ranked faculty hold a tenure-track or tenured (i.e., tenure-line) appointment at the University. A faculty member in a tenure-track appointment, subject to appropriate annual performance, may become eligible to receive tenure in accordance with policy. A tenured appointment is an indefinite appointment that can be terminated only for cause or under extraordinary circumstances such as financial exigency and program discontinuation. Ranks of tenure-track and tenured faculty are: Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor. Further edits were made to remove the use of "Instructional Staff" and replace it with "Faculty" since instructional staff were elevated to faculty status long ago. This was done throughout the handbook except for where it is a part of the bylaws of the Faculty Board. The rationale for not making the change there is that it was proper to defer to the Faculty Board. The description of Clinical Faculty / Faculty of Practice was edited for clarity.

The charge recommended that the Grievance Committee be consulted. The FAC did so and also with the Faculty Hearing Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure. These consultations, in part, revealed that there is a larger matter that should be taken up under a separate charge. Specifically the revision of the dismissal section of the Faculty Handbook (Section IV 3 E). The section should be revised to reflect the developmental practices currently employed, e.g. performance plans, and potentially more closely aligned with AAUP guidelines. The revisions should also reconcile the lack of alignment between Section IV 3 E of the Faculty Handbook, the bylaws of the FHC, and the Nondiscrimination and Anti-Harassment policy. It is the opinion of the FAC that these three policies all need to be updated so that they reference the same committees, processes, timelines, etc. This is an important policy issue since the matter of due process is of paramount importance to, and some might argue is intertwined with, the protections of tenure. Hence, it is the recommendation of the FAC that each of the three aforementioned policies be revised to be consistent across the policies as well as align more closely with the guidelines set forth by AAUP.

Respectfully submitted,

Faculty Affairs Committee

24 March 2019

A review by the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Academic Senate of the bylaws for the Faculty Hearing Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure.

The Faculty Affairs Committee of the academic Senate (FAC) was charged by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate (ECAS) to review the bylaws of the Faculty Hearing Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure (FHC) and identify any areas that may need to be addressed. The FAC assumed the October 2018 version of the bylaws as the basis and as such the comments following all pertain to that iteration of the document. This is important to mention as there is a lack of clarity about whether the October 2018 revisions are valid as they have not been approved by the Senate whereas prior iterations had been. FAC was instructed to consult with the chair of the FHC, which was done. Furthermore the chair of the FHC has reviewed the recommendations of this report and either fully supports or does not take issue with the findings detailed and discussed below.

The specific items identified below, which are organized based upon their order of appearance in the bylaws, can be grouped into a several categories. One category is timing. There is a lack of specificity about when various actions should be taken. Another category entails changes that could enhance the clarity of the document. A third category pertains to process. There are processes detailed that are inconsistent with Section IV 3 E of the faculty handbook and the Nondiscrimination and Anti-Harassment policy.

In the process of performing this review, it became apparent that there is a larger matter that should be taken up under a separate charge. Specifically the revision of the dismissal section of the Faculty Handbook (Section IV 3 E). The section should be revised to reflect the developmental practices currently employed, e.g. performance plans, and potentially more closely aligned with AAUP guidelines. The revisions should also reconcile the lack of alignment between Section IV 3 E of the Faculty Handbook, the bylaws of the FHC, and the Nondiscrimination and Anti-Harassment policy. It is the opinion of the FAC that these three policies all need to be updated so that they reference the same committees, processes, timelines, etc.

An important policy issue that emerged from FAC's review is represented in point 1 of the specific committee recommendations below. The matter of due process is of paramount importance to, and some might argue is intertwined with, the protections of tenure. There appears to be scenarios that can lead to dismissal of tenured faculty wherein faculty cannot muster a full, or potentially even adequate, defense of the action(s) leading to the recommendation of dismissal. Hence it is the recommendation of the FAC that each of the three aforementioned policies be revised to be consistent across the policies as well as align more closely with the guidelines set forth by AAUP.

Related to due process is the consistency of the rules enforced. At present the bylaws are written to enable modification at any time by the committee. This could lead to a lack of consistency in how cases are handled as one case could be handled under a different set of rules than the next. Hence it is the recommendation of the FAC that the bylaws of the FHC be codified in the Faculty Handbook.

Bullet points 17 and 21 address the availability of the records of the FHC's work to the general public. The FAC initially thought that these records should be kept private permanently as they could be construed to be personnel records. However, the Chair of the FHC felt that transparency could be helpful in some cases. The FAC finds the argument on both sides of confidentiality compelling and recommends this issue be investigated. At a minimum, the bylaws should identify to whom and from whom information should be confidential and for what duration.

Two issues were identified that do not explicitly relate to the text of the bylaws, but do impact its operations. The first being the provision of a lawyer to the committee. An attorney was provided to the committee for the hearings held in the 2018-2019 academic year. This proved to be problematic in some ways as it was not clear what the role of the attorney was to be and conflicts of interest were not disclosed. As such, the bylaws should address the matter of an attorney for the FHC and address when one will be hired, what their role will be, how one will be selected, how their presence in the process will be disclosed, and other such related matters. The second issue, broached above, is the legitimacy of the October 2018 version of the bylaws. There needs to be a decision made about how changes to the bylaws are approved and enacted. It is the opinion of the FAC that placing the bylaws into the Faculty Handbook would mitigate this issue.

The specific recommendations of the committee follow:

1. Dismissal process in the bylaws does not seem to comport with that laid out in the academic freedom and tenure policy approved by the full faculty, specifically in the event of allegations filed under the antidiscrimination policy. An additional matter to investigate and resolve is whether the findings of the antidiscrimination policy should be binding. Importantly, matters of due process should be investigated and reconciled with UD's dismissal procedure and that of the AAUP.
2. The bylaws should be integrated into the faculty handbook to assure consistency of implementation.
3. In section III B the definition of faculty member is inconsistent with the handbook and as a result suggests that adjuncts and possibly lecturers are not able to avail themselves of this policy.
4. Section IV B 3 should be integrated with or immediately follow IV B 1 to improve clarity.
5. In section IV B 3 the committee felt that the name of the chair should be published somewhere, possibly in the minutes of the first senate meeting of the new academic year.
6. In section IV B 4 the time within which appeals should be distributed should be quantified.
7. Section IV B 8 should follow immediately after IV B 5 to improve clarity.
8. Section IV B 9 should provide a time window within which the appeal will be distributed.
9. Sections V B and V C should provide a time window for the pre-hearing within which the actions should transpire.
10. The title for section VI should be updated to reflect the name of the policy which it covers.
11. In section III A the definition of the term "dismissal" needs greater precision and there is confusion introduced by the phrase "specified term".
12. Section VII A 2 should state that if evidence is available it must be shared at least 14 days prior to the hearing. The section could be integrated into VII A 1 for improved clarity.
13. Section VII D should be moved either in front of VII A or integrated with VII C to improve clarity.

14. Section VII C 3 should include a limit on the time to request the printed or electronic copy.
15. Section VII C 6a should indicate that in cases of dismissal the administration should make its case first.
16. Section VII C 6b should indicate that faculty can cross examine witnesses, not just the administration.
17. Section VII D 5 should have the phrase “after the hearing has concluded” removed so as to ensure that confidentiality is maintained permanently.
18. Section VII E 3 and 4 should clarify that the President may reject the recommendations put forward in the report, not the report itself.
19. Section VII E 4 should clarify what, if anything, gets reported to the faculty and through what mechanism, e.g. report to ECAS, and when.
20. Section VII E 5 should add that the records should be transferred at the close of the process.
21. Section VIII C 2 should confirm that the records remain permanently confidential and to/from whom.
22. Section IX A should have the phrase “at any time” removed.
23. Section IX B should add the approval of another faculty body after the committee’s approval. It should be determined which body is most appropriate, e.g. ECAS, Senate, full faculty.

26 April 2019

TITLE: **UNIVERSITY PROMOTION AND TENURE POLICY**

DATE: September 25, 2006; revised February 1, 2007; revised February 20, 2007 and March 2, 2007; April 20, 2007.

ACTION: Legislative authority

REFERENCE: II. B. 1.c. Will require faculty vote as specified in this section of the Constitution of the Academic Senate.

Introduction

Promotion and tenure decisions are among the most important made at the university and as such should be made with great care. Indeed, the quality and nature of faculty accomplishments in scholarship, teaching, and service largely determines the quality and reputation of the institution as a whole and its ability to further its mission. Promotion and tenure decisions are extremely important to the life of the institution as they not only recognize the faculty member's existing body of work, but also make judgements about the future contributions by the faculty member to the university. As such promotion and the awarding of tenure are mechanisms by which the University retains its most valuable scholars, sustains excellence in its instructional programs, and promotes its mission for service.

As a Catholic and Marianist educational community, our University is committed to linking learning to leadership and service, educating the whole person through a learning community of challenge and support, collaborating for adaptation and change, and search for truth grounded in both faith and reason. All of these goals require a diverse faculty, full and equitable inclusion of the faculty in all facets of university life, and the recognition of the skills, gifts, and talents of the faculty and all others in our community. Beyond a commitment to these Catholic and Marianist principles, upon which the University was founded, the University recognizes the competitive advantage that can accrue from their full implementation.

Promotion and tenure decisions are among the most important events in a faculty member's professional life. Accordingly, it is essential that all faculty members be treated fairly and granted due process in the deliberations that determine promotion and tenure.

The University Promotion and Tenure policy establishes general guidelines that govern University-wide procedures for promotion and tenure review. These guidelines and procedures are designed to ensure communication, fairness, and due process throughout the review process. This policy includes opportunities to respond in the event of disagreements over promotion and tenure recommendations and provides an appeals procedure.

In addition, this policy provides a process for initial and periodic review of promotion and tenure documents for procedural consistency and clarity of substantive criteria both at the unit and department level.

I. Establishment, Review, and Approval of Promotion and Tenure Criteria and Procedures

A. Definitions

- Tenure is a status of employment wherein a ranked faculty member's relationship with the university can be terminated only for cause or under extraordinary circumstances such as financial exigency or program

discontinuation.

- Promotion of tenure line faculty is advancement in rank from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, or Associate Professor to Professor.

B. General University-wide Criteria and Eligibility for Promotion and Tenure Evaluations

1. Criteria for promotion and tenure focus on the academic credentials and the academic performance of the applicant. The faculty member's performance will be evaluated as appropriate to the profession in the areas of:
 - a. Teaching effectiveness and/or librarianship,
 - b. Scholarship and/or artistic accomplishment, and
 - c. Service, including professional, departmental, University, and community.
2. Tenure will not be granted to a faculty member whose rank is below the level of associate professor. Normally, tenure will be considered at the same time as promotion in rank. However, faculty may be promoted to associate professor prior to being granted tenure. Faculty members who have already been granted tenure at the assistant professor level prior to implementation of this policy will retain their tenure and rank.
3. Tenure-track faculty with no prior service credit will be considered for tenure no later than their sixth year of active, full-time service. Time devoted to leaves of absence, sabbaticals, or other interruptions in the annual performance of teaching, research, and service may affect the total period of evaluation and the timing of departmental reviews. The effects of such interruptions on the period of evaluation and timing of reviews must be agreed to in writing by the faculty member, chairperson, dean, and Provost at the time that the interruption takes place or within six months of the initiation of the interruption.
4. A candidate who successfully completes the promotion and/or tenure process will be granted promotion and/or tenure with his or her next contract.

C. Unit and Departmental Authority and Responsibilities

1. Each academic department will adopt clear criteria and procedures for promotion and tenure.
2. The College of Arts and Sciences, School of Business Administration, School of Education and **Health Sciences**, and School of Engineering will have an elected, representative unit promotion and tenure committee comprised of tenured faculty members from the unit. Each unit's procedures may allow for the dean to appoint up to two additional representatives in any given year. The School of Law and University Libraries, because they have fewer than 30 tenure and tenure-track members, will not be required to conduct elections. They will set appropriate processes in place to establish unit promotion and tenure committees, and those processes will be reviewed by the University Promotion and Tenure Committee (hereafter, the University Committee).
3. The unit's Promotion and Tenure Committee will
 - a. make a recommendation for promotion and tenure on each individual candidate to the dean, and
 - b. review and approve its department-level criteria and procedures for promotion and tenure.
4. Any disagreements between a department and a unit promotion and tenure committee related to approval of departmental promotion and tenure criteria and procedures will be resolved by the appropriate dean.

D. University Academic Senate Authority and Responsibilities

1. The Academic Senate will establish the University Committee and provide oversight of the elections of faculty members to the University Committee.
2. The Academic Senate will determine all University-wide procedural policies on Promotion and Tenure and explicate such policies in the Faculty Handbook. If the University Committee notes inconsistencies between documents not covered by

University-wide procedural policies on promotion and tenure, those procedural inconsistencies will be submitted to the Academic Senate for resolution.

E. The University Committee

1. The University Committee will
 - a. review and approve the promotion and tenure policies of all units for consistency with University policies and procedures
 - b. annually review the promotion and tenure process for adherence to appropriate procedures and present a report to the Chairperson of the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees and the President of the Academic Senate. The President of the Academic Senate will annually present this report to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate.
2. The University Committee will consist of fifteen tenured faculty members: seven from the College of Arts and Sciences (two from the Humanities, one from the Visual and Performing Arts, two from the Natural Sciences, two from the Social Sciences); two respectively from the School of Business Administration, the School of Education and Health Sciences, and the School of Engineering; and one each from the School of Law and the University Libraries.
 - a. The University Committee members will be elected by tenure and tenure-track members of their respective constituencies.
 - b. Members of the University Committee will serve three-year terms (maximum of two consecutive terms, with staggered terms within and across units); all members will be tenured with rank of associate professor or professor and cannot hold an administrative appointment (including departmental chairpersons, assistant and associate deans, deans, and other full or part-time administrators with line authority). The University Committee will elect a chairperson from those duly elected. The chairperson shall serve for one year, and may serve consecutive terms. Terms will begin effective June 1 of the year elected.
 - c. Any individual who cannot complete his or her term of office will be replaced from the list of candidates in the year in which the member was elected. Candidates not elected to the University Committee will be listed by area in the order of votes received, beginning with the highest, and will, in that order, be asked to fill vacated positions.
3. The University Committee will approve those unit documents that define clear substantive criteria and procedures consistent with University policies, including mechanisms for communicating throughout the entire promotion and tenure process.
4. After the initial approval has been received by a unit, the University Committee will review that unit's policies every three years. Whenever substantive changes are proposed, the unit promotion and tenure documents must be approved by the University Committee for consistency with University policies and procedures.
5. In the event the University Committee does not approve unit documents or proposed changes to them, and if the dean of that unit disagrees with the decision of the University Committee, the matter will be resolved by the President in consultation with the Provost.
6. The Provost's office will be responsible for providing administrative support for the work of this committee and assuring that all documents are distributed in a timely and appropriate manner.

II. Common Processes for Promotion and Tenure Evaluations

A. Common process for pre-tenure review

1. The approved University, unit, and departmental criteria and procedures will be shared with the candidate at the time of hire by the Office of the Provost. These will be the basis of the pre-tenure, final tenure, and promotion reviews.
2. Each unit dean will establish a timetable regarding the submission and review of pre-tenure materials.

3. During the pre-tenure period, every candidate will receive a minimum of two reviews of his or her teaching and/or librarianship, scholarship and/or artistic accomplishment, and service by his or her department and the appropriate dean, with the final review conducted the year prior to the final departmental tenure recommendation. The School of Law and University Libraries will have only a unit review.

4. Credit toward tenure granted for prior service

- a. A candidate who is given two or fewer years credit toward tenure will receive two comprehensive reviews (as described in II.A.5 below).
- b. A candidate receiving three or more years credit toward tenure will receive a minimum of one review of his or her teaching and/or librarianship, scholarship and/or artistic accomplishment, and service by his or her department and the appropriate dean, with the final review conducted the year prior to the final departmental tenure recommendation. The number of and timing of the review(s) will be explicated in the candidate's first letter of hire. The School of Law and University Libraries will have only a unit review.
- c. Any changes in the tenure clock after this first letter of hire may require a change in the review cycle. Such changes must be agreed to in writing by the faculty member, chairperson, dean, and Provost.

5. Pre-tenure review process

- a. A candidate will submit his or her review materials and supporting documentation for review to the responsible persons (i.e., departmental chairperson, departmental promotion and tenure committee) at the departmental level. (The School of Law and University Libraries will have only a unit review. Materials will be submitted directly to the unit dean.)
- b. After giving adequate consideration to the materials, each department/unit will provide written feedback to the candidate in a timely fashion as designated by the departmental (unit in the case of the School of Law or University Libraries) promotion and tenure document. In addition to a statement regarding progress toward tenure, feedback will include comments of a developmental nature, in line with the criteria for tenure, indicating areas of concern and suggestions for improvement.
- c. The candidate's review materials, supporting documentation, and the written feedback will be forwarded to the appropriate unit dean. The dean will then review the materials and provide written feedback to the candidate in a timely fashion.

B. Common application and final review process for tenure and/or promotion

- 1. Each unit dean will establish a timetable regarding the submission and review of promotion and tenure materials.
- 2. The review materials for promotion and tenure will be cumulative. Materials generated as a result of review at the departmental level (unit in the case of the School of Law or Libraries), including letters from chairperson, departmental promotion and tenure committee, and response, will become part of the application package and will be forwarded to the unit for review. Likewise, materials generated in the unit review, including letters from dean, unit promotion and tenure committee, and responses, will be forwarded to the Provost for review.
- 3. Materials of a substantive nature which update the submitted application (e.g., acceptance or publication of a manuscript) can be added to the application by the candidate at any point in the tenure review process until the Provost's recommendation is made. It is expected that appropriate consultation will take place if materials are added that will affect the recommendation.
- 4. Each academic department (unit in the case of the School of Law or University Libraries) will develop a "Procedural Form" that itemizes the promotion and tenure steps that are to be followed in the department and unit. As steps are completed, each of the responsible persons (e.g., departmental chairperson, departmental promotion and tenure committee, chairperson of the unit promotion and tenure committee, and dean) in the unit will provide his or her signature, acknowledging that steps were completed in accordance with the departmental and unit procedural policies and indicating the date in which steps were

completed. Each candidate will be provided an opportunity to sign, acknowledging receipt of written documentation and the date it was received. A candidate's signature will not indicate agreement with the feedback or recommendations at any given point.

5. Departmental Application and Review Process (does not apply to School of Law or University Libraries)

- a. A candidate will submit his or her application and supporting documentation for promotion and/or tenure to the departmental chairperson by the date specified by the departmental promotion and tenure documents.
- b. After giving adequate consideration to each application, each department, in accordance with its unit promotion and tenure procedures, will make a promotion and tenure recommendation in writing to the appropriate unit promotion and tenure committee regarding each candidate. A letter from both the departmental chairperson and departmental promotion and tenure committee will go forward to the unit promotion and tenure committee. These letters will specify the reasons for the departmental recommendations and will be copied to the respective candidate.
- c. If the candidate chooses, he or she can respond in writing. This response will be forwarded with all related materials to the unit promotion and tenure committee.

6. Unit Application and Final Review Process (applies to all units)

- a. The specific administrative process for submitting material, including to whom, must be specified in each unit's promotion and tenure policies.
- b. After giving adequate consideration to each application, each unit promotion and tenure committee will make promotion and tenure recommendations regarding each candidate in writing to the appropriate dean by the date specified in the unit promotion and tenure documents.
- c. After giving adequate consideration to the application, the unit dean will inform each candidate, in writing, of the recommendation and the reasons for it no later than the first business day following December 14. In units that conduct departmental reviews, this letter will be copied to the departmental chairperson. After ensuring the candidate has received notification, the departmental chairperson will share the recommendation with the departmental promotion and tenure committee. The dean will also inform the unit promotion and tenure committee of the recommendation.
- d. Candidates or concerned individuals (e.g. departmental chairpersons, or promotion and tenure committee members) who wish to submit a written response to the dean have until the first business day following December 21 to do so.
- e. The dean will then consider any additional evidence and responses and send a recommendation in writing to the Provost, along with the completed "Procedural Form," cumulative file, and the response(s) of any candidate or concerned individuals no later than the first business day after January 1. In units that conduct departmental reviews, this letter will be copied to the departmental chairperson, no later than the first business day following January 1. After ensuring the candidate has received notification, the departmental chairperson will share the recommendation with the departmental promotion and tenure committee. The dean will also inform the unit promotion and tenure committee of the recommendation.

7. Provost Recommendation Process

- a. Candidates or any other concerned individuals (e.g. departmental chairpersons, or promotion and tenure committee members) have until the first business day following January 15 to file a written response to the dean's recommendation with the Provost.
- b. The Provost will review all materials and make recommendations to the President no later than the first business day following January 30. Each candidate will be informed in writing of the Provost's recommendation. Candidates or any other concerned individuals (e.g. departmental chairpersons, or promotion and tenure committee members) who wish to submit a written response to the Provost will have until the first business day following February 15 to do so.

8. Final Administrative Authority

Final administrative authority rests with the President. Each candidate will be informed in writing of the President's decision. This decision will also be copied to the Provost, the appropriate dean, and the appropriate departmental chairperson.

9. Mediation and Appeals

If the candidate chooses to appeal the President's decision, he or she may begin the mediation process in accord with the Faculty Handbook, Section IV.E. If mediation does not resolve the complaint, the candidate may make use of the appeal processes set out in the Faculty Handbook (Sections IV.C.1, IV.E, and XIII.E.). The Board of Trustees will serve as the court of last resort in the appeals process.

10. Report to the Board of Trustees

a. The President will provide the Board of Trustees with a report of promotion and tenure actions at the spring meeting. The summary report will minimally include statistics regarding the gender and minority status of candidates.

b. The University Committee will receive a copy of the President's summary report on promotion and tenure no later than two weeks prior to the spring Board meeting.

c. The University Committee will review the promotion and tenure process for adherence to appropriate procedures and will examine the President's summary report before compiling a report of its own to present to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees at the Board's spring meeting. This report will also be provided to the President of the Academic Senate who will present it to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate.

III. Implementation of the University application and review process for promotion and tenure.

A. Following passage of this policy by the faculty members, the Provost will send a letter to each tenure-track faculty member who has received three or more probationary contracts prior to May 15, 2008.² The letter will inform these tenure-track faculty members that they have the choice to be evaluated relative to the procedure and criteria for promotion and tenure which were in place at the time of their most recently affected probationary contract or relative to the resolutions presented here. Each affected tenure-track faculty member will submit his or her choice to the Provosts' office within six months of the passage of these resolutions. Tenure-track faculty members who have received two or fewer probationary contracts prior to May 15, 2008 will be evaluated relative to the resolutions presented here.

B. Faculty members who have been granted the rank of associate professor as of May 15, 2008 will follow procedures for promotion to full professor as explicated above.²

C. The elimination of the provisional tenure year will be implemented with the first set of contracts distributed following the approval of these resolutions.

D. Work of the University Committee

1 Elections for University Committee members will be conducted in Fall 2007.²

2 Each unit will submit its procedural policies for promotion and tenure to the Provost's office. Those materials should be submitted as early as January 1 and no later than April 1, 2008.²

3 The University Committee will review all promotion and tenure procedural by May 15, 2008.²

E. Initial rotation of members³

1. Members to initially serve a three year term: Law, Libraries, Arts, Humanities(1), Natural Sciences(1)
2. Members to initially serve a two year term: Social Sciences(1), Business(1), Education(1), Engineering(1), Humanities(2)
3. Members to initially serve a 1 year term: Natural Sciences(2), Social Sciences(2), Business(2), Education(2), Engineering(2)

¹School of Law includes the School of Law faculty and Law Library faculty.

²Dates assume passage of the above resolutions by Fall 2007.

³Candidates with the highest number of votes in areas where two representatives are elected are designated by the number 1 in the rotations listed above. Candidates with the next highest number of votes in those areas

8c: Final SAPC Report for Academic Year 2018-2019

Date: April 26th, 2019

Chair: Lee Dixon; Members: Todd Smith, Fran Rice, Myrna Gabbe, Joanna Abdallah, Leila Chamankhah, Sanders Chang, Eddy Rojas, Markus Rumpfkeil, Andrew Strauss, John White, Connor Savage, Tom Skill

Faculty Board Guest: Andrea Wells

As chair, I thank the Student Academic Policies Committee for their dedicated work over the course of the academic year.

To briefly review our accomplishments, we:

- Completed the charge regarding student academic misconduct that was given to SAPC the year prior. Completing this charge involved examining and interpreting the results from a survey regarding this topic that had been completed at the end of the 2017-2018 academic year. Further, during the completion of the charge, Beth Harrison, Associate Director, LTC, was invited to share with the committee the experiences had by students who take exams in the Office of Learning Resources. A report was created and then presented to ECAS on March 8, 2019, and then the Academic Senate on March 29, 2019.
- Completed the charge regarding examining policies that would likely be affected by changes to the University Promotion and Tenure policy. In completing this charge, the committee looked at the policies listed in the Faculty Handbook and the University Promotion and Tenure Policy Task Force report to determine gaps and/or misalignment with the current University Promotion and Tenure policy. The committee had relatively little time to carry out this charge, as it was received toward the end of the academic year. Thus, the recommendations that were included in the final report that was presented to the Academic Senate on April 26, 2019 are meant to act only as a potential starting point for the Policy Review on P&T Policies Working Group that will convene in the summer of 2019.

Recommendations of the outgoing committee for the 2019-2020 SAPC:

- Given that it is not likely the recommendations made in the report on academic misconduct will be carried out fully and/or in short order, the committee recommends that the 2019-2020 SAPC see to it that at least all recommendations made in the report that do not necessitate changes to policy be enacted. Special attention should be paid to recommendations that address aligning current procedures with policies regarding academic misconduct, as well as those that address clarifying and streamlining current procedures.

8d: Final ECAS Report for Academic Year 2018-2019

Date: May 3, 2019

Membership: Joanna Abdallah, Paul Benson, Corinne Daprano (President), Sam Dorf, Mark Jacobs, Leslie Picca (Vice President), Fran Rice, Eddy Rojas, Markus Rumpfkeil, Connor Savage, Andrea Seielstad, Todd Smith (Secretary), Chris Agnew (Faculty Board representative)

I'd like to spend a few minutes this afternoon updating you on the work the Senate has done this past academic year and talk a bit about a very important initiative the Senate began work on this year and that will continue working on throughout next year.

As I mentioned way back in September at the opening Faculty meeting of the academic year, I anticipated a busy and interesting several months as Senate President.

I anticipated that we would be:

- reviewing and revising our academic policies and procedures document,
- reviewing new degree and certificate programs,
- looking at changes and additions to the Faculty Handbook,
- reviewing recommendations to change the University Tenure and Promotion policy,
- reviewing possible changes to the Academic Honor Code

Indeed, the Senate has accomplished these initiatives and more. These are just a few of the key documents the Senate has reviewed and approved this year:

- Bachelor of Science in Sustainability (CAS) – approved March 29, 2019
- Bachelor of Arts in Sustainability (CAS) – approved March 29, 2019
- Undergraduate Certificate in Group Facilitation and Leadership (Dept. of Communication) - new certificate – approved April 12, 2019
- Bachelor of Science in Health Sciences (SEHS) – approved April 26, 2019
- Bachelor of Science in Sport and Wellness (SEHS) – approved April 26, 2019
- Actions Pertaining to Degree Programs and Academic Departments (Revised) (Academic Policies Committee) – approved March 29, 2019

As well as:

- Revisions to the Faculty Handbook (FAC)
- A report on Student Academic Misconduct (SAPC)
- A report from the Academic Advising Task Force, and
- The report and recommendations from the Senate's University Promotion & Tenure Policy Task Force

In addition, the University Promotion & Tenure Policy Task Force report was delivered to ECAS in December. In January, Carissa Krane, chair of the task force and other task force members presented the report to the Senate in January. The report is currently posted on the Faculty tab on Porches. For today, I would like to highlight four key recommendations from the report and present a few of the action items the Senate has begun this spring semester.

Recommendation #1

#1 - University Promotion and Tenure Policy be revised to include a definition of tenure, a robust mission and values statement that emphasizes the University commitment to diversity, equity and inclusion, and the function of promotion and tenure in furthering the mission of the university.

Recommendation #2

#2 – University Promotion and Tenure Policy be revised to include a directive that Units/departments identify and recognize specific mission and/or values-driven activities, commensurate with faculty academic, professional, and contractual expectations, in evidence/impact-based evaluation of faculty teaching and/or librarianship, scholarship/artistic creation, and service in Unit/Department promotion and tenure policies.

Recommendation #3

#3 – Relevant University policies that support the implementation of the criteria for evaluation and review of all faculty be revised to introduce/address emerging mission/values-based criteria and the processes for the evaluation of evidence/impact-based faculty performance.

Recommendation #4

#4 – University prioritize, resource and incentivize faculty participation in a multi-year process to re-examine University, Unit and Department Promotion and Tenure policies to better align promotion and tenure expectations, criteria, and evaluation processes with the emergent integrative ways in which faculty pursue their work on behalf of the University and its mission.

After the Senate's discussion with the task force in January, ECAS went to work crafting an implementation plan to begin work on the task force's recommendations. This is not the entire implementation plan (*see full implementation plan attached to this report) but it is a few of the key action items that we have already begun:

- Review #1 of key UPTP revisions in light of Faculty Handbook revisions (see UPTPTF recommendation #1)
- Review #2 of key UPTP revisions in light of Faculty Handbook revisions (see UPTPTF recommendation #2)
- SAPC begins a review of key policies listed in report (see UPTPTF recommendation #3)
- Academic Senate resolution accepting UPTPTF report
- Create summer working groups: 1) campus engagement working group; and, 2) policy review working group (see UPTPTF recommendation #4)

Looking forward the Senate will: 1) continue to address action items of the promotion & tenure task force (the mission and values component to T&P policy and other related policies); 2) continue to update the Faculty Handbook (the dismissal process); 3) investigate issues with SET; and, 4) make recommendations for improving student academic integrity processes.

I'd like to end my remarks today by thanking the 2018-19 members of ECAS Leslie Picca, Vice President (CAS - SocSc), Todd Smith, Secretary (CAS – NS), Sam Dorf (CAS – HUM), Mark Jacobs (SBA), Fran Rice (Libraries), Dean Eddy Rojas (SOE), Dr. Markus Rumpfkeil (SOE), Prof. Andrea Seielstad (LAW), Provost Paul Benson, Joanna Abdallah (Graduate Student), Connor Savage (SGA), the Senate committee chairs – Mark Jacobs (FAC), Anne Crecelius (APC), Lee Dixon (SAPC), and Carissa Krane – chair of the task force.

University Promotion & Tenure Policy Task Force Report

Academic Senate Action Items

Task	Assigned to	Consultation Expectation	Update	Work due
Review #1 of key UPTP revisions in light of Faculty Handbook revisions (see UPTPTF recommendation #1)	FAC	Carolyn Phelps	April 2019; Dec. 2019	April 2020
Review #2 of key UPTP revisions in light of Faculty Handbook revisions (see UPTPTF recommendation #2)	FAC	Carolyn Phelps	April 2019; Dec. 2019	April 2020
SAPC begins a review of key policies listed in report (see UPTPTF recommendation #3)	SAPC		April 2019	Completed April, 2019 – report
Academic Senate resolution accepting UPTPTF report	ECAS	Senate		Completed April 26, 2019 Senate meeting
Chair collaborative sessions to address how to lead department level discussion regarding TF report/ recommendations	ECAS	Deb Bickford Faculty Development	May 2019	Dec 2019
Dean's Offices assist with department, sub council, unit level discussions of TF report and recommendations	Provost Office	Deans, Associate Deans, Department Chairs	May 2019	Fall 2019
Set agenda/action steps for summer/fall semester 2019	ECAS			April 2019
Create summer working groups: 1) campus engagement working group; and, 2) policy review working group (see UPTPTF recommendation #4)	ECAS	UNRC		April 2019
Schedule nationally recognized speaker for fall 2019	ECAS	Paul Benson, Deb Bickford, Deans	May 2019	Fall 2019

University Promotion & Tenure Policy Task Force Major Recommendations

1. University Promotion and Tenure Policy be revised to include a definition of tenure, a robust mission and values statement that emphasizes the University commitment to diversity, equity and inclusion, and the function of promotion and tenure in furthering the mission of the university.
2. University Promotion and Tenure Policy be revised to include a directive that Units/departments identify and recognize specific mission and/or values-driven activities, commensurate with faculty academic, professional, and contractual expectations, in evidence/impact-based evaluation of faculty teaching and/or librarianship, scholarship/artistic creation, and service in Unit/Department promotion and tenure policies. Examples of these include, but are not limited to: community

engagement, venture creation and entrepreneurship, shared governance, inter/transdisciplinary work, education abroad, and experiential learning.

3. Relevant University policies that support the implementation of the criteria for evaluation and review of all faculty be revised to introduce/address emerging mission/values-based criteria and the processes for the evaluation of evidence/impact-based faculty performance. This requires the revision of all of the relevant policies on faculty evaluation, peer evaluation, evaluation of teaching, merit, workload, and post-tenure review, currently found in the Faculty Policy and Governance Handbook. In addition, revisions to Promotion and Tenure Policies will likely impact the Clinical Faculty Promotion Policy and the Lecturer Promotion Policy.

4. University prioritize, resource and incentivize faculty participation in a multi-year process to re-examine University, Unit and Department Promotion and Tenure policies to better align promotion and tenure expectations, criteria, and evaluation processes with the emergent integrative ways in which faculty pursue their work on behalf of the University and its mission.